HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. X, No. 32 Wednesday, August 12, 1953 Washington, D. C.

On Taft: The scribes and Pharisees, we note, are apparently seeking to create a Taft "myth"— a myth of an amiable, but short-sighted fellow who had been rather sporting about his nomination defeat and rather obliging towards Ike since January.

That's not how we will remember the Senator. We will preserve a mind-picture of him as a rare *genus*, a politician whose immortal characteristic was moral courage. Only a year after fighting with Germany had stopped was scarcely the opportune time for a politician, ambitious to become President, to make the speech Taft gave at Kenyon College, in which he assailed the Nuremberg trials as *ex post facto* law. It was a brave act, but must have cost him dearly politically.

AUG 18 '53

Such a stand should not have been surprising. He was publicly critical of the trial of the "Thirty Crackpots" in 1944-5, when Attorney General Biddle sought to prosecute a weird collection of individuals for treasonous conspiracy. The evidence and legal basis were so farcical that the case eventually blew up and was dismissed. The accused were not exactly the kind of people for whom a politician would risk his reputation. But Taft was thinking only of the law and justice.

As we look back in memory, we best recall Taft as "telling 'em" — that is, imparting some unpleasant truth to someone, often "liberals" or their dupes who worked to conceal the truth. We remember, at one social function, how Taft tried to educate John J. McCloy who just then had been named High Commissioner to Germany. Taft was telling McCloy — who seemed amazed to hear the news — that the Nuremberg trials had given to the German people a very bad impression of allied justice.

Again, in our mind's eye, we can see Taft bluntly telling Professor Arnold Toynbee (at a party) how little foreign aid should be extended to Europe — including the Professor's own country.

Then a different picture — Taft in January, 1947, glumly explaining how, because of a parliamentary situation, he had to take the chairmanship of the Labor Committee. He obviously realized the persecution which would follow his efforts for labor reform, but he clearly felt he had to do his duty. We thought that the Senator knew his chances for Presidential nomination would suffer because he would "alienate labor".

In view of so many magnificent examples of his courage, how was it possible that the people could reject such a man? One answer might be that the people did not have a fair chance to vote a decision; or that the true picture of the man was never really presented to them, in a manner intelligible to them.

We wish that a proposal — made several years ago by some Taft advisors, but never accepted — had been utilized. The idea was to present Taft in the same way in which Grover Cleveland was so successfully presented. Cleveland, who — like Taft — made the scribes and Pharisees of his day so mad by his blunt honesty, rode to the White House on the campaign slogan "We love him for the enemies he has made". Thinking back, Taft grows in stature as we recall the enemies he made.

Maybe the suggestion still isn't lost. As the Taft legend grows — and it will — the idea might well fit the man designated by fate and his own courage to become the "spiritual heir" of the unforgettable Senator from Ohio.

The Direction: When President Eisenhower was inaugurated on January 20, the question that loomed big in many minds was: What direction will the new Administration take? Will it continue on the leftward path of its Democratic predecessors or would there be a "change"?

Copyright 1953 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Six months have passed, Congress has completed the first lap of the course and many are now looking to the record for an answer. Among these are a number of Republican Congressmen whose interest in the question is heightened by the fact that next year their political lives will hang on the public reaction to the answer. Several to whom we spoke during the last days of the session are disturbed by a quick evaluation of the Administration that is going the rounds: "just a Republican New Deal". Will their constituents feel that way?

The evaluation is based on these broad facts: the Administration has committed itself to the foreign aid program of the Truman Administration, with consequent involvement in the affairs of these countries; though there has been some reduction in the amount appropriated for foreign aid, this reduction was effected by Congress against the opposition of the Administration.

There has been no lowering of the tax burden, despite a campaign promise. The Administration forced through Congress an extension of the Excess Profits Tax law, to which the Truman Administration gave the June 30th termination date. It also killed an effort, for which there was considerable support in Congress, to make a reduction in personal income taxes.

While there has been some reduction in the national payroll, mainly through the process of non-replacement of discharged or resigned employees, nothing like a dismantling of the bureaucracy has occurred. The OPS, already dying, was the only bureau that was finally laid to rest. On the other hand, a lessor bureau was raised to Cabinet status, the Department of Welfare, where, as usually happens, the functions and payroll will be enlarged.

Particularly disappointing to many was the Administration's failure to get rid of the many thousands of minor officials, researchers, propaganda experts and so-called economists (the class who, in the final analysis, actually shape the policies that the higher officials mouth) whom it inherited. This fact, plus the appointment of some whose ideological ties are with the past — like Dulles, Bohlen, Smith and Conant — is most disheartening to those who expected a "change".

Finally, nothing has been done during these six months to promise a change in the "handout" policy of the Truman-Roosevelt regimes.

In all fairness, however, it should be said that those who voted for Mr. Eisenhower because they hoped for a re-direction of governmental policy were actually reading their hopes into his campaign. He did not promise the "change" they have been expecting. He did pledge himself, in the campaign, to "clean out the mess in Washington". But, he did not spell out the phrase, at least not so that it would amount to a commitment to effect the "change" some Republicans want.

Could Mr. Eisenhower have been elected if — complying with the wishes of various advocates of "change" — he had declared an intention to stop spending forthwith, take steps to pull out of the UN, withdraw our troops from foreign shores, close up Government agencies, drop parity prices, get the government out of the banking business, sell the TVA to private industry and generally undo all that had been done under the New-Fair Deals? We believe, and so said during the campaign, that some specific declaration along these lines would have been welcomed by the voters. On the other hand, as the Eisenhower camp maintained, it may be that the country has during the past twenty years made a comfortable adjustment with centralization and collectivism, and any effort to disturb that adjustment would be resented.

Perhaps the Eisenhower Administration during its first six months has followed the politically-wise course, even as did the Conservatives in England when they took over the reins of government from the Laborites. Not until the country expresses itself in favor of the "change" at the polls will it happen.

The Last Straw: In the last days of the session, the Administration pounced upon Congress a proposal to authorize extention of the national debt limit by fifteen billion dollars. This act, more than any other, indicated that its overall policy is grooved in the path of its Democratic predecessors.

Since 1934, when President Roosevelt fell under the spell of Keynesian economists, the fiscal policy of the government has been shaped by the theory that the prosperity of the country is merely a matter of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spending, and has little to do with production. If the people do not spend enough, or fast enough, the government must come to their rescue by confiscating their income for spending purposes. It does not make much difference what the government spends the money for, just so long as the spending is fast and furious. However, since the people are ignorant of economics, and like to hold on to their earnings, it is politically unwise to tax them too heavily, too quickly. It therefore becomes necessary at times for the government to "manufacture" money and spend it. That is, the government issues I.O.U.'s — bonds and short-term paper — and sells them to the public. With the revenue from such sales the government can continue spending us into prosperity.

The I.O.U. has the further advantage of creating spending money for the public. When it gets into the hands of the bank, this institution can make loans against it. By the process of re-discount, the amount of "checkbook" money that can be created on the basis of this bond can total nearly six times its face value. The increased purchasing power shows up in the market, where the affluent buyers bid up the prices of things. That is inflation. The inflation would not occur if the amount of goods in the market were increased in proportion to the purchasing power. But, since the government "consumes" merchandise in the amount of its borrowings, merchandise that never reaches the market, there is nothing to hold down the prices.

However, according to the doctrinaires, this inflation is not bad — provided it does not run away; that is, does not reach the point where people lose faith in money. In fact, "controlled" inflation is a good thing. Everybody has a lot of money and "feels rich", even though the money does not buy any more things than could be bought with less money before the inflation.

That is the theory. The Eisenhower Administration apparently has accepted it. The increase of its borrowings by fifteen billions would, eventually, show up in an increase of the nation's spending power by nearly ninety billions of dollars, and thus make for new "prosperity". The "big guns" of the Administration who begged Congress for permission to issue more paper did not touch upon this consequence; they raved about the danger of not being able to make ends meet and thus impairing the Government's credit. They shed copious tears. Fortunately, the sound thinkers in Congress, led by Senator Byrd of Virginia, were not moved. The power was not granted.

After the bill was defeated, the Administration admitted that it might not really need the additional borrowing power; by exercising economy and calling on its reserves it might, if September income tax returns are large enough, get by. In the meantime, those who voted for the Administration's request were in a tight spot. One Indiana freshman Congressman received a wire from "back home" telling him that in voting for the Administration bill he had "signed his political death warrant".

David and Goliath: Some weeks ago, the tax-free Ford Foundation announced that it had appropriated $15 million "to be used to 'investigate' the investigating powers of Congress, from the critical point of view", as Representative Carroll Reece of Tennessee declared on the floor of the House several days before adjournment. Continuing, Representative Reece explained that the fund was "to be expended to attack the Congress for inquiring into the nature and extent of the Communist conspiracy, on the grounds that Congress was 'abridging civil liberties' of individuals by requiring them to answer whether or not they were Communists".

During the last week of the session, Congress retaliated by authorizing an investigation of tax-free foundations. A committee, headed by Representative Reece, will begin looking into the operations of these organizations, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the funds at their disposal are being used to further the cause of Communism and socialism. The vulnerability of these foundations is their special tax exemption privilege, which can be withdrawn if it is shown that their funds are used for the purpose of influencing legislation, or for purposes not specifically allowed in their charters.

The 82nd Congress had such a committee. The amount appropriated to it was seventy-five thousand dollars. The chairman, Representative Eugene E. Cox, fell ill and died before the work of the committee was done. Actually, the work of its ridiculously small staff covered less than four months, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only seventeen days all told were devoted to hearings. Even though the final report of this committee tended to whitewash the foundations (the Ford Foundation was not looked into), there was evidence enough to show that their funds were not infrequently used to support left-wing causes.

Whatever funds will be given to the Reece committee, it is a certainty that the amount will be nowhere near $15 million, probably not more than one per cent of it. So, we have the spectacle of a public David challenging a private Goliath.

●

A Century of Conflict, by Stefan T. Possony. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. $7.50. Reviewed by Isaac Don Levine.

The growing crisis within the Soviet empire since the death of Stalin has, among other things, put to a severe test many of the myths about the Kremlin's designs so dear to certain of our policy-makers. Some of us have been shocked to discover that even elementary truths about the Soviet power have not yet penetrated the minds of quite a few of our military and political pilots.

The appearance at this time of Dr. Possony's *A Century of Conflict* is, therefore, especially welcome. Here at last we have within the scope of a single volume a comprehensive and penetrating analysis of the Communist techniques of World Revolution for the period of 1848-1950. It is a volume which should these days be on the desk of every editorial writer, every statesman, and every wide-awake person interested in the overshadowing phenomenon of modern history — the imperial Soviet dictatorship.

Dr. Possony's documented and exhaustive study covers all the factors that go to make up the strategy of the global Communist conspiracy aiming to seize hold and expand power until it encompasses the whole world. The reader of *A Century of Conflict* will have no trouble understanding the developments of Soviet policy since the passing of Stalin. When he puts down this volume, the following propositions will be self-evident to him:

First, that in a critical situation such as has been confronting Moscow in recent months the basic principle of Soviet policy is to seek a "peredyshka" — a breathing spell.

Second, that full-scale, outright war could occur only when two rival capitalist camps clashed, in which event, as Stalin taught, the Soviets "must enter last".

Third, that the Kremlin must be on guard against being drawn into a prolonged war. This fear, as the author shows, led to the Soviet surrender to Japan in Manchuria in 1929 and to the wooing of Hitler and Matsuoka in 1939.

Fourth, that offensive action by the Soviet power is possible only when its strength is at its peak and when the rear is made safe so as to avoid being caught between two fires. With it goes the proposition that no chances be taken with any "putsch" based upon overrating a "revolutionary" situation.

Fifth, when the Soviet leadership decides upon a retreat, such as the Kremlin has been executing since Stalin's death, it must be camouflaged as an advance.

"No offensive action should be risked at a time when Communist forces suffer from material weaknesses, demoralization, faltering support", Dr. Possony sums up this cardinal Communist principle. With it goes the corollary that "the fundamental rule of defensive action is to protect the life force of Communist power. . . . Space and time are expendable as long as the life force of Communism is preserved for future counteroffensives."

In framing a policy for the current post-Stalin upheaval, the Department of State and the Pentagon could very well use a tablet bearing these truths. Dr. Possony's work is evidence that the United States possesses not only material but also spiritual and intellectual superiority for the historic task of bringing about, through measures short of war, the defeat and collapse of the Communist aggressors.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED